



Mercer County Regional Planning Commission

TO: Coordinating Committee Voting Members and Interested Individuals

FROM: Matt Stewart—Senior Planner, MCRPC

SUBJECT: April 12, 2022 MPO Coordinating Committee Meeting

DATE: April 5, 2022

The Coordinating Committee of the Mercer County MPO will hold a virtual meeting on Tuesday, April 12, 2022 at 10:30 A.M. The meeting will be conducted using the GoToMeeting platform, with online and phone-based options available to members and the public. Instructions for joining the meeting are included on the top of the (attached) agenda and also will be posted under the “Mercer County MPO and Public Information” page of MCRPC’s website (within the “transportation” sub-section) at <https://mcrpc.com/transportation/mercercounty-mpo/>.

There will be many items of importance at our April meeting. We will consider adoption of the draft Transportation Improvement Program, discuss an upcoming funding round of our popular STU funding, and provide the usual up-to-date information regarding transportation funding, planning, policy, and projects in Mercer County. As you’ll note on the agenda, there are several action items regarding the movement of funds and procedural votes on our programs.

Should you have any questions or if you have any technical difficulties in joining the meeting on the 12th, please contact our office at 724.981.2412, x3206 or email Dan, Brian or me (dgracenin@mcrpc.com, bbarnhizer@mcrpc.com, or mstewart@mcrpc.com).

Thank you!



AGENDA

Shenango Valley Area Transportation Study Metropolitan Planning Organization Tuesday, April 12, 2022 (10:30am) Coordinating Committee Virtual Meeting

Virtual Meeting through GoToMeeting Platform—Join-in Information:

Join via computer, tablet or smartphone:	Dial by phone (long distance rates may apply):
https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/341608989	+1 (408) 650-3123 (access code 341-608-989)

Note: Items marked with a star (★) are action items requiring a vote.

- Roll Call
- Approval of Minutes of the January 18, 2022 MPO Coordinating Committee Meeting★
- 2021-2024 TIP Modifications
 - Non-IIJA/BIL Modifications (Brandon Leach, PennDOT CPDM)★
 - IIJA/BIL Modifications (Courtney Lyle, PennDOT D-1)★

Note: Information regarding these modifications will be posted to the “Mercer County MPO and Public Information” page of MCRPC’s website (within the “transportation” sub-section) at <https://mcrpc.com/transportation/mercer-county-mpo/>.
- DRAFT 2023 TIP Discussion & Approval
 - Summary of TIP progress and conversations (various MPO and PennDOT staff members)
 - Other TIP documents, public comment plan and next steps (Matt Stewart, SVATS MPO)
 - Review and approval of Final Draft Highway TIP project listing (Courtney Lyle, PennDOT D-1)★
 - Review and approval of Final Draft Transit TIP project listing (Jill Boozer, MCRCOG)★
- 2021-2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan Re-Approval (Matt Stewart, SVATS MPO)
 - AQ Conformity Report and Resolution★
 - LRTP Re-Adoption★

The MPO approved the LRTP in November 2021. Upon federal review, we were asked to specifically and separately prepare and approve an Air Quality (AQ) Resolution, which would then trigger a re-adoption of the plan itself so that approval dates align (subsequent to the AQ resolution). Note: the plan itself and the AQ Conformity Report have not changed, so this is merely a procedural action.
- STU Discussion (Matt Stewart, SVATS MPO)
 - Details of STU Funding Announcement
 - Overview of STU program and TAC’s recommended changes
 - Application period timeline and next steps
 - FY 2022 STU Funds; City of Sharon request★
- Project Update Summary
 - STU and TA Projects (Brian Barnhizer, SVATS MPO)
 - Major Projects/Other TIP Projects (Ron Johnson, PennDOT D-1)
 - Planning and Data Collection Updates (Brian Barnhizer and Matt Stewart, SVATS MPO)
 - Springfield US 19 Study
 - 2022 Traffic Counts
 - Congestion Management Processes Update
- MPO Stakeholder Educational Resources Update (Matt Stewart, SVATS MPO)
- Transportation Funding Updates (Kevin McCullough, PennDOT CPDM)
- Upcoming Meetings
- Additional Discussion
- Adjournment

MINUTES

SHENANGO VALLEY METROPOLITAN
PLANNING ORGANIZATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE
VIRTUAL MEETING
Tuesday, January 18, 2022 – 10:30 A.M.

PERSONS PRESENT

Steve Paxton
Jeremy Coxe
Cindy Black
Jasson Urey
Gary Hittle
Holly Nogay
Zachary Miles
Paul Hamill
Erin Houston
Lyndsie DeVito
Kim DiCintio
Mark Longietti
Richard Stachel
Courtney Lyle
Dale Perry
Ed Reese
Emily Aloiz
Melissa Phillips
Chelsea Beytas
Diane Helbig
Matthew Crea
Ron Johnson
Tom McClelland
Brad Elder
Brandon Leach
Matthew McConnell
Sandy Swogger
Ronnique Bishop
Kevin McCullough
Don Hall
Brian McNulty
Bob Lark
Brian Barnhizer
Matt Stewart
Dan Gracenin

REPRESENTING

Findley Township
Hermitage City
Wilmington Township
Town of Greenville
Hempfield Township
Mercer County Housing Authority
PennDOT
Greenville Borough
Shenango Valley Urban League
PennDOT
Mercer County Regional Council of Governments
State Representative
Pine Township
PennDOT
Shenango Township
GPD Group
Erie County MPO
Sharon City
FTA
State Senator Michele Brooks
PennDOT
PennDOT
PennDOT
Mercer County Bridge Department
PennDOT
Mercer County Commissioner
Mercer County Area Agency on Aging
FHWA
PennDOT
WRA
PennDOT
West Middlesex Borough
MCRPC
MCRPC
MCRPC

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Matt Stewart called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. **A quorum was present.**

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

Mr. Jeremy Coxe mentioned that annually we appoint a Chair and Vice-Chair. He indicated that currently he holds the position as Chair and Mr. Gary Hittle serves as Vice-Chair. Both stated that they are willing to continue if the board would like to go in the same direction. The floor was open for any other nominations. There being none, **Mr. Stachel made a motion to close the nominations and retain Jeremy Coxe as Chair and Gary Hittle as Vice-Chair for 2022. Mr. Urey seconded. The motion passed.**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 9, 2021

Mr. Coxe stated that the Minutes were sent out with the meeting packet and asked if there were any additions, corrections or deletions to the Minutes of the November 9, 2021 meeting. There being none, **Mr. Coxe asked for a motion to approve. Mr. Lark so moved, Ms. DiCintio seconded. The motion passed.**

2021-2024 TIP MODIFICATIONS

Mr. Brandon Leach went over three Administrative Actions and two Informational Items. (A copy is attached to and made a part of the permanent record of Minutes.) In addition, we re-affirmed the amendment passed via e-ballot in December, which was an action to add all-weather pavement markings to FY 2022. Mr. Coxe suggested that someone from PennDOT reach out to Shenango Township and follow up on that; maybe even Mercer County Maintenance.

2022-2024 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM REVIEW AND ADOPTION

Mr. Stewart gave a brief overall of the work program that has been developed and is something we do every two years. This document is something that has received a lot more attention over the past three cycles. The work program is tailored to the work that is actually done in the office and is a pretty long process, takes 5-6 months from start to finish, and we are now ready to have this considered for adoption.

The work program starts out with an introduction of what the UPWP is, as well as some information about our County and then goes into what we are responsible for doing. After all of the regional TIPs are submitted, there is a section on statewide TIP findings which the Federal agencies review and provide recommendations on how they can improve this process. There is a section on how the MPO is structured and responsibilities of the 25 voting members, as well as how our technical committee fits into everything. There is a section on our coordination process with various levels of PennDOT staff, the transit agency, Mercer County Regional COG as well as various stakeholders and different agencies and various members of the public that are involved.

The work program development process and timeline are essentially the most important overview of some of our highlights of our tasks. In general, a lot of the work that is done will continue on in the same pattern, but will focus more on different planning projects and special studies. Over the next two years, we expect to conduct a study to analyze the growing list of bicycle and pedestrian-related projects that have been brought forward from different planning studies and assist in prioritizing these projects. This was a recommendation from our Long-Range Plan and are hoping to accomplish this in year one. Mr. Conti, MCRPC staff and an avid bicyclist, will work with Mr. Stewart and Mr. Barnhizer and figure out the details. During the second year, we plan to conduct a corridor study along SR 358 and nearby roadways (SR 58, Kidds Mill Road, Wasser Bridge Road) in the general area from the Town of Greenville and the Reynolds area of Pymatuning and Hempfield Townships going out to the I-79/SR 358 interchange in New Vernon Township. This study would identify concerns related to freight movement, safety and other related issues that can be made across the system to facilitate economic development in this northern part of the county. The timetable for work will focus on major key deliverables such as when we will be submitting our next TIP, etc.

Under the work tasks, there are budget summary tables for the two years, and each year shows the work tasks. These work tasks were simplified by reorganizing subtasks to better reflect the work completed for each task. Each work task describes what the task is, what the deliverables are for the time period, and what we did over the past two years related to this task. Mr. Stewart asked if there were any questions or comments related to the work program so we could adopt the UPWP. There being none, **a motion was made by Mr. Stachel and seconded by Mr. Hittle to approve the UPWP. The motion passed.**

DRAFT 2023 TIP DISCUSSION

A. Revised financial guidance resulting from IJJA/BIL - Mr. Stewart mentioned that there is a lot of new information to share regarding how the TIP is being developed. Under the Revised Financial Guidance our average annual allocation increased from \$12.9m to a little under \$18m a year, so the total highway TIP has increased a little over 38%. On the transit side, what is being developed is based on the original financial guidance and this is still to be determined on all of the details regarding how the extra money will be distributed. On the highway side, when looking at the longer term which goes through the 12-year program, the increase is a little over 40% or roughly a little over \$5m per year increase. Under the revised version, the categories that are in red, are the ones that had a significant change. The first one is the NHPP, which is the money that goes toward the National Highway System, and in our case, is State Route 18, 62, portions of 58 and our interstate highways. This money has increased significantly, but declines each year from 2023 to 2026. The reason for that is more of the NHPP money is being diverted into the interstate TIP pot of money, but overall a significant increase. Most of the other main categories of funding did not change too much. The BOF funding (Bridge Off System) has essentially doubled and has a lot of money being spent towards local bridges, which most are owned by the County. The Transportation Alternatives TA(U) and STP-Urban had revisions. We receive our own allocation, or think of it as an entitlement of transportation alternatives, because we are in an urbanized area. Over the years, our TA money was \$41,000/year, but has significantly increased to over \$100,000/year. Likewise, the STU money has been growing in recent years from \$600,000 to as high as \$900,000 per year. The biggest increase is a new program called the Bridge Reinvestment Program that goes toward an increased level of investment specifically for bridges, which is \$2.3 million dollars per year, and is a new funding source.

B. Summary of TIP progress and conversations – Mr. Stewart mentioned that the process of putting the TIP together has been over a year and a half from start to finish and the vast majority of the work takes place over a nine-month window, and we are about two-thirds of the way through that window. Six meetings have been held with the district and central office, as well as Federal partners to discuss the process and what goes into getting our listing of projects. First, we have to be consistent with the guidance documents which states how much money we should receive and what the rules are for eligibility of projects. Next, consideration is taken of all the carryover projects to make sure those projects are advancing into construction. Also, PennDOT has many different priorities and they try to tie everything together to make sure that all the things that they feel are highest priorities are moving forward. The MPO staff makes sure that we are following our planning process, particularly our Long-Range Transportation Plan, which itself ties in many of these past planning studies that we have done, and make sure those projects are continuing to advance. There are many other considerations that we need to meet since there is a lot more data-driven process that goes into the TIP as we transition toward a lowest life cycle cost philosophy of maintaining roads and bridges vs. addressing the worst ones first. A lot of work goes into matching the available funding sources to eligible projects. Then, environmental justice has become an increasing focus of the TIP, with consideration of disadvantaged populations, striving toward equity in investment.

C. Review of District 1's proposed highway TIP project listing – Mr. Dale Perry questioned the status of the Sieg Hill Project in Shenango Township and to see if it was able to advance on the TIP. Ms. Courtney Lyle stated that they are planning to let that project in the spring of 2023 and stated that this project was not able to advance due to the design timeline. Ms. Lyle mentioned that they were able to advance 26 projects on our TIP for construction in the next 12 years. They were able to advance the construction of 26 projects at least one year on our TIP, which entails 20 bridges, 5 roadway projects and one intersection. They were also able to add 17 projects to the TIP, which entails 10 bridges

and 7 projects that include roadway and/or intersection improvements. Three out of the seven projects came directly from the Long-Range Transportation Plan, which entails an intersection improvement project at 62/Bestwick, 62/Neshannock and 318 at the intersection of Mercer Avenue and Morefield Road. These three projects were programmed out for the second four years on the TIP and are still adding structures to the TIP. With that increase in funding, we have most of the bridge funding allocated to projects in the first six years and are continuing to evaluate projects and adding them into the last six years. PennDOT met with Brad Elder, County Bridge Engineer, and are currently looking at increasing the allotment that we are giving for local bridges. Going into this TIP update with the original financial guidance, we are going to be giving local bridges \$1.531 million/year. Right now, we are looking at adding \$300,000 to that, with the discussion that as we start programming projects, that the locals would like added, we will evaluate whether we have the capacity to add more than that \$1.8 million/year or not. PennDOT will continue to look at local bridges and see if they are able to fit them around some of their other projects that they are looking at adding, since there was an increase in BOF and BRIP funding. With this increase in funding, PennDOT is looking at a dollar percentage going towards the LRTP projects. With this increase in funding and the increase of adding those intersection projects, which she mentioned earlier, we will see an increase of \$5.5 million to the LRTP projects over 12 years. She stated that as they move through programming projects with the TA and STU funding as projects go through TAP or multimodal, they will look at how they can move some of the other projects around. In discussion, Commissioner McConnell mentioned that during a recent call with Senator Casey, he indicated that through the Federal funding there would be another \$93 million for the off-system bridges. Ms. Lyle mentioned that she recently heard about the potential increase in funding.

D. Review of MCRCOG's proposed transit TIP project listing – Ms. DiCintio mentioned that during the 2023-2026 transit TIP they will purchase a small vehicle, 1 vehicle every 4 years. They will also purchase two CNG buses, since two of their current buses will be reaching the end of their useful life. Also, they have ADA related expenses, which are for the complimentary paratransit to provide services to our ADA clients. Asset maintenance will allow us to purchase parts and pay for certain mechanic positions, etc. for the operation. They are also looking at doing some interior and exterior upgrades as well as ADA upgrades to the shop/garage and office. Finally, they will have money available for upgrading shop equipment, and office equipment over the next four years.

E. Open conversations – Mr. Stewart asked if there were any questions about the TIP project listing or do they have any questions about the process that we are going through. Commissioner McConnell mentioned that recently there have been more fatalities occurring along the Shenango Valley Freeway in the City of Sharon. He informed the City of Sharon, as well as Brad Elder, to coordinate with the State, because the County is looking at those bridges as a possible replacement and it would be important that we coordinate all together on this. Mr. Stewart stated that the traffic unit of District 1 and our staff have been involved with the City of Sharon and are hoping to use some of the HSIP (Highway Safety Improvement Project) funding to make some improvements there and to address the overall corridor as well as the walking bridge for the students, all should be taken into consideration.

F. Next steps – Mr. Stewart stated that there are many other portions of the TIP that will be developed or are being worked on right now and plan to get all of you the information prior to our April 12, 2022 meeting. After the Committee has a time to look over all of this, a Draft TIP will be approved, followed by a 30-day comment period and then we will approve the Final TIP at our July 12, 2022 meeting.

PROJECT UPDATE SUMMARY

---Transportation Alternatives and STU Project Status Reports - Mr. Barnhizer gave a few brief summaries of the TA and STU projects. He noted that Mr. Stewart and himself will be meeting online later this afternoon with PennDOT staff, the Borough Administrator, the Director of the County Bridge Department and others to discuss the status of the **Mercer Borough McKinley Avenue Bridge Replacement Project**. There was nothing to report regarding the **Route 58/18 Intersection Project in the Town of Greenville**. He mentioned that he received an email from Jason, Whitman Requardt Engineer regarding **The City of Sharon's Gateway Project**. He informed me that WRA is planning to

advertise the project within the next week or two. Once a couple of minor hurdles are cleared, the design portion of the project will basically be complete, and the engineer hopes to see construction start this summer with the completion of curbs, gateway signs and landscaping completed by the fall. The installation of updated signals will not take place until the spring of 2023. Next, he noted that we received an update from the Township's engineer regarding the **Springfield Township SR 208 Multimodal Path Project, Phase II**. The final construction plans, specifications and cost estimates were completed and submitted to PennDOT on December 3rd for their review. The engineer also indicated that they are waiting for PennDOT's review and approval of the final right-of-way plans. He also noted that PennDOT did notify him that coordination with the solicitor and affected property owners can be initiated after PennDOT sign offs on the right-of-way plans.

Ms. Lyndsie DeVito, District Planner at PennDOT mentioned that she received the updated plans and everything else she needed for the City of Sharon's Gateway Project and they plan to advertise this week.

---Major Projects/Other TIP Projects – Mr. Ron Johnson mentioned that they are still working through the right-of-way process with title research for the 3008 State Street Project. This process is taking a little while, but we want to get all of the right-of-way information accurate. He noted that the consultant is still working through the PE phase and the archeology effort for the Route 18 and Route 58 Intersection Project near Thiel College. There was some discussion regarding some paving for this project to the north of the intersection since it is in very rough shape. PennDOT will do everything they can to add some paving in there.

---Planning and Data Collection Updates – Mr. Barnhizer mentioned that the traffic counts were completed at the end of October and the HPMS field reviews were done by the end of November and submitted in the beginning of December.

The Springfield US 19 Corridor Study encompasses US 19, roughly ½ mile north of the Lawrence/Mercer County line to Hunter's Run. This also includes short section of SR 208 and Leesburg Station Road. The study cost \$30,000 and roughly \$2,500 of that is coming from the Township. Trans System of Pittsburgh is the consultant and we have been working with them since September. The contract was executed in mid-September and the consultant began data collection, which they have done quite a bit of data collection over the past several months. A first Steering Committee meeting was held virtually on November 4th and the second Steering Committee meeting was held at the Township Building on December 8th, followed by the first public meeting for the project, and it was pretty well received. Four more Steering Committee meetings will be scheduled soon, and one more public meeting will be held prior to the completion of the project and we anticipate that being late spring of this year.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING UPDATES

Mr. Keven McCullough mentioned that we have been discussing the IIJA since it was passed a few months ago and the first direction officially came out from Federal Highway this past Friday. There were some press releases over the weekend and there have been a few questions regarding this. More details will be forthcoming. They are still working out the 2022 funding that is rolling out. For all of the carryover programs and for this new bridge funding, PennDOT anticipated amounts for the draft TIP, which is fine for creating the draft TIP. However, for 2022 money, which is also a part of the IIJA, it is the first FFY of that five-year bill. There are a lot of programs that have carryover money, which has not been nailed down. PennDOT has estimates and are planning for certain things, but they cannot make any changes or amendments to the program yet. They are still waiting on direction. On Friday was the first step toward heading toward that direction. They did receive direction with regards to what we call the Bridge Formula Program. This new bridge category will have an additional \$1.6 billion for the Commonwealth over the five-years, which has been anticipated in the draft TIP. However, for 2022, PennDOT will still need to work out the details on getting the money programmed. Approximately, \$320 million is available in FFY 2022 across the Commonwealth and Mercer County should expect it to be very similar to those previous numbers listed on the RIP. PennDOT anticipates to fix more than 3,000 bridges in Pennsylvania with the overall bridge money, over the next five years. Once that direction does come out, the district will be working very closely with the locals to take advantage of any of those requirements

where anytime you do not have a local match, of course, that could help us accelerate some projects.

Ms. Ronnique Bishop, from FHWA reiterated that the guidance came out on Friday for the Bridge Funding Program and FHWA will be working with PennDOT on how to further implement the program. She noted that she will put a link in a chat to where you can actually look at the guidance on the FHWA's agency website.

STU DISCUSSION

Mr. Stewart mentioned that it has been a year and a half since we last awarded some STU monies. If your municipality or agency have a project that they would like to move forward and are willing to put some money into it, the STU monies are a very wonderful funding source. We are looking at \$900,000/year to do this, which is a pretty significant amount of money. With that being said, the MPO is talking about another funding round. Currently, they are in the process of trying to get a handle on all of the available funding, because there is some money hanging out in certain years that was not spent. Over the next few weeks, we will be working with the district to make decisions on how much to open this up and to what years we want to program projects out of. Sometime, early Spring, we will have a Technical Advisory Committee meeting to talk through some possible changes to the scoring criteria, make the guidelines clearer and try to improve the process even more. Once we hammer out all of those details, hopefully we can open an application round in April or May. The next MPO meeting is scheduled for April 12th and hopefully we can discuss this with everybody at the meeting. Once the application process is open and we go through some of the details, we would close the application process a month or two after that. The next step would be to hold another TAC meeting in late June or early July to go through the projects in detail and make a recommendation to the MPO Committee at their July 12th meeting.

Mr. Stewart mentioned that there will be a meeting this afternoon with PennDOT to discuss one of their projects that is hanging out there. STU funding that was awarded to this project in FY 2022 and because the project still has work to do before it goes out to bid, there is a danger of possibly losing some of that funding. Currently, they are looking at other ideas in order to prevent this from happening or are there other projects that we can put this towards. Ms. DeVito stated that some of this money is tied to the 2021 year and the money can not be moved. Mr. Stewart mentioned that when a municipality applies for STU monies, we need to make sure that those projects are moving along.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Ms. Chelsea Beytas, FTA Community Planner introduced herself. She noted that she has been working with Mr. Stewart reviewing some of the planning documents that FTA creates. She wanted to thank the MPO staff for all of the great work that they produce. Recently, the FTA worked on reviewing the UPWP, which was approved today at this MPO meeting. There is some great information in there with the background and the task activities that are included, particularly the timetables and working on improving the planning process and products that they create. Mr. Stewart thanked her for attending the meeting today and mentioned that it is really nice to have someone on board from the FTA, since Ms. Beytas has offered a lot of really good comments.

Mr. Brian McNulty mentioned that there has been a shortage about glass beads and paint. There was some concern about our paint lines for our roadway earlier that was related to the COVID pandemic. It is a requirement that the glass beads need to be in the paint in order to give the paint the reflectivity. Since then, this problem has been resolved. Also, he wanted to remind everyone the importance of the TIP and be familiar with what we are looking at and recognizing that we are communicating this to everyone to understand.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a motion was made by Mr. Urey and seconded by Mr. Coxé to adjourn the meeting at 11:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel M. Gracénin,
MPO Secretary

DMG/ew

[illegible]

[illegible]

* PE-NEPA, FD-PSE CO, UTL-Fnl UTL Clr, ROW-Cond ROW, CON-Lst

* Includes Conversion Amount

+ Indicates phase qualifies for TOLJ. funds

s.Spike

Full Flexed

1

Economic Development

4. Discussion

10

FFY 2023 SVTS TIP

Date: 3/31/22 2:51 PM
RPT# TIP216D

Project Information			FFY 2023 Costs					FFY 2024 Costs					FFY 2025 Costs					FFY 2026 Costs				
Project	Project Title	Sponsor	Fed.	Federal	St.	State	Local	Total	Fed.	Federal	St.	State	Local	Total	Fed.	Federal	St.	State	Local	Total		
77148	ADA Related Expenses	SVSS	5307	72,479	PTAF	13,302	318	98,579	5307	72,479	PTAF	13,302	318	98,579	5307	72,479	PTAF	13,302	318	98,579		
83653	Asset Maintenance Exp	SVSS	5307	100,000	164	44,212	788	225,000	5307	100,000	164	44,212	788	225,000	5307	100,000	164	44,212	788	225,000		
83656	Shop Garage Equipment	SVSS	5307	2,000	164	9,825	105	50,000	5307	2,000	164	9,825	105	50,000	5307	2,000	164	9,825	175	50,000		
83658	Office Equipment	SVSS	5307	12,118	164	2,976	53	15,147	5307	8,000	164	1,867	33	10,000	5307	8,000	164	1,867	33	10,000		
95412	Safety & Security	SVSS	5307	7,247	164	1,788	32	9,069	5307	7,247	164	1,788	32	9,069	5307	7,247	164	1,788	32	9,069		
95413	Office & Garage Improvements	SVSS	5307	90,000	164	22,106	394	112,500	5307	80,000	164	19,650	330	100,000	5307	80,000	164	19,650	330	100,000		
102638	Vehicle Purchase	SVSS	5307	192,800	OT11-S	66,357		259,157	5307	166,000	OT11-S	58,557		224,557	5307	166,000	OT11-S	58,557		224,557		
102638	Vehicle Purchase	SVSS	5339	74,148	5339			74,148	5339	74,148	5339			74,148	5339	74,148	5339			74,148		
111059	Small Transit Buses	SVSS	5307	72,000	OT11-S	17,685	315	90,000	5307	72,000	OT11-S	17,685	315	90,000	5307	72,000	OT11-S	17,685	315	90,000		
111060	Operating Assistance	SVSS			OT11-S	897,141	82,799	979,937			OT11-S	897,141	80,055	984,076			OT11-S	897,141	80,055	984,076		
118142	Replace Service Vehicle	SVSS	5307	30,000	OT11-S	9,825	172	30,000	5307	30,000	OT11-S	9,825	172	30,000	5307	30,000	OT11-S	9,825	172	30,000		
Total for: Shonango Valley Shuttle Service				764,799		1,678,244	60,883	1,803,924		764,799		1,678,244	60,883	1,803,924		764,799		1,678,244	60,883	1,803,924		
Overall Totals:				764,799		1,678,244	60,883	1,803,924		764,799		1,678,244	60,883	1,803,924		764,799		1,678,244	60,883	1,803,924		

FY 2022 STU Item:

Our MPO is in the somewhat unusual situation of having just over \$750,000 of remaining STU dollars in the current (2022) fiscal year which must be obligated and expended soon. In addition, the City of Sharon recently opened bids for their previously-funded Sharon Gateway STU project (US 62 at the state line). Like so many other recent bids, they found the bid amounts to be significantly higher than what had been estimated, presumably because of rapid inflation and because most contractors have plenty of work.

Although our MPO staff has repeatedly stressed that applicants should ensure that cost estimates are reasonable at the time of initial request and not request additional dollars, the cost increases in recent months are unprecedented, or at least above what might be seen over the past several decades. Given the amount of use-or-lose STU funds available, our Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recently discussed possible ways to allocate this money. The recommendation from that board was to see if Sharon wanted to make a formal request and, if so, bring this before the Coordinating Committee. At the April 12th meeting, PennDOT D-1 and MPO staff will discuss this further and lay out other options for this funding. Sharon subsequently wrote a formal request letter, copied below:

Robert G. Fiscus
City Manager
rfiscus@cityofsharon.net
www.cityofsharon.net



155 W. Connelly Blvd.
Sharon, PA 16146
Phone: (724) 983-3220
Fax: (724) 983-3225

April 1, 2022

Matthew Stewart
Senior Planner
Mercer County Regional Planning Commission
2491 Highland Road
Hermitage, PA 16148

Mr. Stewart,

With unprecedented price increases that are beyond the City of Sharon's (City) control, the City has been put in a unique situation of trying to move forward with the Sharon Gateway project. This project is not only a gateway to the City of Sharon but also to Mercer County. The bids came in approximately \$226,000 higher than what the engineers estimated. The City would like to humbly request assistance in closing this funding gap.

I would like to thank you for consideration in our additional funding request.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Robert Fiscus', is written over a horizontal line.

Robert Fiscus
City Manager
City of Sharon